Docket No.: 36409-01

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated November 17, 2004, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 17, 2004. Accordingly, no Extension of time is believed necessary. In the event that the Commissioner determines an extension of time or fee is due, applicants hereby petition for such extension of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge any required fee to the Milbank deposit account number 13-3250.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-30 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 are independent claims.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of statutory authority as a basis for claim rejections.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15, 18-22, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chihara et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,428), in view of Machine Design. The Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 16, 17, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chihara and Machine Design in view of Rager et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,363,447).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 22, 25-27 and 28-30 now on file clearly recite that in a communication system of the present invention, which includes an information processing device on a user side, an information processing device on a supplier side, and an output device, the output device is arranged to include first connection means and second connection means so that the output device receives a request from the information processing 15 NY2:#4628547

Docket No.: 36409-01100

device on the user side through the first connection means and also receives data according to the received request from the information processing device on the supplier side through the second connection means to output the received data. Further, the information processing device on the supplier side is arranged so as to determine a type of the output device to transmit the data thereto, and control transmission of the data to the output device in response to the determination. According to this feature of the present invention, data is transmitted to only an output device which has a particular function, such as a security function. This feature can also control alteration of the data or obtaining the data illegally.

The above-described features of the present invention are not taught from either of the primary cited references of Chihara and Machine Design. The reference of Chihara, as the Examiner states in the Office Action, fails to teach that the output device includes the first and second connection means as recited in the independent claims now on file. Therefore Chihara does not disclose the information processing device on the supplier side functioning together with the information processing device on the user side and the output device through the first and second connection means, as recited in each of the independent claims now on file. The reference of Machine Design merely discloses to transfer a print job to a printer device which is connected to an internet. The Machine Design reference does not explicitly disclose that the printer device which has a first connection means further include a second connection means (page 7 of the Office Action), and therefore Machine Design also fails to teach data transmission control by the information processing device on the supplier side functioning together with the information processing device and the output device through the first and second connection means as recited in the independent claims now on file.

Accordingly, applicant submits that neither Chihara nor Machine Design individually or in combination disclose or suggest the presently claimed inventions, and 16

withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

III. Request for Reconsideration

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP

Chris L. Holm Reg. No.: 39,227

February 14, 2005

Militanit Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)